

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 14 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action of 08/14/2006 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, which indication is appreciatively acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected as being anticipated by Bucksch. Claims 1-5 and 7 were rejected as being unpatentable over Van Der Zee in view of Bucksch. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 7, which has been canceled. The obviousness rejection, insofar as it applies to prior claim 7, is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of the references in the manner suggested. Van Der Zee and Bucksch teach *alternative* approaches to voltage divider compensation. In the Van Der Zee approach, a compensating capacitive structure is formed by a conductor situated above the resistive divider chain. The conductor is shaped to provide the appropriate compensation in localized regions. In Bucksch, a conductive well is formed underneath the resistive divider chain. The geometry of the resistive divider chain is altered to provide the appropriate compensation in localized regions. There is no teaching or suggestion in the references themselves to combine the teachings of the references in the manner suggested.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 11/13/06